

**Southeast Oregon Resource Advisory Council (SEORAC)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 23-24, 2001**  
**Ontario, Oregon**

**FINAL MINUTES (as of July 9, 2001)**

**Members Present:**

Jill Workman, Group 2, National/Regional Environmental and SEORAC Chairperson, Portland, Oregon  
Tom Harris, Group 1, Commercial Recreation and SEORAC Vice Chairperson, Keno, Oregon  
Chad Boyd, Group 3, Academician, Hines, Oregon  
Dick Leever, Group 1, Transportation or Right-of-Way, Klamath Falls, Oregon  
John Monfore, Group 1, Commercial Timber, Klamath Falls, Oregon  
Jane O'Keeffe, Group 3, Elected Official, Adel, Oregon  
Marilyn Miller, Group 3, Public at Large, Bend, Oregon  
Ken Bentz, Group 1, Grazing, Drewsey, Oregon  
Cecil Dick, Group 3, Tribal, Burns, Oregon  
Walt Van Dyke, Group 3, State Employee, Ontario, Oregon  
Howard Brooks, Group 1, Minerals, Baker City, Oregon  
Bob Kindschy, Group 2, National/Regional Environmental, Vale, Oregon

**Members Absent:**

Mike Golden, Group 2, Dispersed Recreation, Redmond, Oregon  
Lee Belknap, Group 2, Archaeologist/Historian, Mitchell, Oregon  
Vacant, Group 2, Wild Horse and Burro, Hines, Oregon

**Designated Federal Officials (DFOs):**

Thomas Dyer, District Manager, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Burns District Office, Hines, Oregon  
Steve Ellis, District Manager, BLM, Lakeview Interagency Office, Lakeview, Oregon,  
Acting for Chuck Graham, Forest Supervisor, Forest Service (FS), Fremont and Winema National Forest,  
Lakeview, Oregon

**DFO Assistants:**

Sharon Sweeney, Facilitator/Public Affairs Specialist, FS, Malheur NF, John Day, Oregon  
Mark Armstrong, Coordinator/Public Affairs Specialist, BLM, Burns District Office, Hines, Oregon  
Holly LaChapelle, Administrator/Resource Assistant, BLM, Burns District Office, Hines, Oregon

**Presenters:**

Scott Florence, Lakeview Resource Area Field Manager, BLM, Lakeview Interagency Office, Lakeview, Oregon  
Sandy Guches, Acting District Manager, BLM, Vale District Office, Vale, Oregon  
Jerry Taylor, Field Manager, BLM, Vale District Office, Vale, Oregon  
Roy Masinton, Field Manager, BLM, Vale District Office, Vale, Oregon  
Miles Brown, Andrews Resource Area Field Manager, BLM, Burns District  
Cody Hansen, Three Rivers Resource Area Field Manager, BLM, Burns District  
Tom Schmidt, Pacific Northwest Coordination Group  
Steve Grasty, Harney County Judge, Burns, Oregon

**Others Present: (sign-in book)**

Jim Keniston, Snow Mountain/Burns District Ranger, Malheur National Forest

Larry Meyer, Argus Observer, Ontario, Oregon

Rhonda Karges, Management Support Specialist, BLM, Burns District

Jennifer Fenwick, BCWC

Chris Davis, Bully Creek Coalition Chair

\*One additional person signed in the book but the handwriting could not be read. Please refer to the official SEORAC file for the sign in sheet to view signature.

**Monday, April 23, 2001**

08:00 Welcome, introductions, housekeeping, agenda review, expiring terms, tour, review minutes, and subcommittees - Jill Workman, Sharon Sweeney, and Tom Dyer.

The SEORAC cannot vote today since the council does not have enough members in Group 2. This is only the second time in our history that this has happened.

Mark Armstrong gave us an update on Vic Pritchard. A remembrance/presentation is planned for our next meeting in Burns, Oregon.

**Charter Review:**

John Monfore asked if under objective and scope, they could add the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) not just the FS and the BLM.

Jane O'Keeffe inquired about adding the National Marine Fisheries Service and John Monfore stated that the Marine Board was not under the Department of the Interior or Department of Agriculture.

Chad Boyd asked about the history behind the agencies involved. Tom Dyer explained the history and the use of RACs and charter groups.

Jill Workman suggested that several changes are needed because of the Steens Mountain Advisory Council (SMAC) creation, for example, do we exclude the area that the SMAC has jurisdiction over or do we work together for this area? Could a liaison be appointed for each RAC and should we add this requirement to the charter? We need to have a mechanism to coordinate the two RACs.

Sharon Sweeney pointed out an education requirement listed on Page 5, Item (I), noting the need to coordinate this training and be proactive in member education or take out it out of the charter. Jill Workman stated that the RAC needs to comply with this education requirement. John Monfore added that the tours are very informative and related to this requirement. Jill Workman stated that the BLM did provide courses earlier in the RAC history and may need to do this again. She also stated the SMAC should have this course available to them. Chad Boyd suggests that the charter restate that the education should be encouraged rather than required; the tours do assist in this effort of educating the council.

08:30 Update: SMAC - Miles Brown

Miles gave a copy of the legislation/act, the legislative summary from the Steens Mountain web site, the draft interim management policy on the Cooperative Management and Protection Area (CMPA) (not a plan, but an Instruction Memorandum for our State Office), the SMAC nomination package, and a new interim map (available for sale at the BLM, Burns District Office). He discussed the SMAC creation, the positions, the press release, and the timeframe for the creation of the council. The draft interim management policy was then discussed and along with future plan development and the hiring of a Burns District Planner. Possible dates for the Steens Dedication would be between August 13-20 to coincide with a congressional break. The land exchanges are moving forward and the BLM hopes to have them completed this summer. The BLM, Burns District is releasing a range improvement Environmental Assessment (EA) document next week and working with the grazing permittees and environmentalists on this plan. The 3-year phase-in period for grazing was not in the final legislation/act but all parties do agree that the grazing system will have to be completed over several years as seedings and range improvements are started/completed. The legislation/act did close a number of roads in the Steens Mountain Area and the BLM has been very busy signing and barricading these roads. We will be using minimal tools in the wilderness area to determine how we will work on the road erosion issues. The BLM has been working with the local Chamber of Commerce to develop/design the entrance sign for the Steens and our local youth correctional facility to make these signs.

A question was asked about the Witzel School proposal status. Tom Dyer gave an update of the Oregon Land Use Board decision. Currently, the Witzel's would have to appeal the decision of the Oregon Land Use Board. Also, possible land exchange proposals are being considered.

Miles continued discussions of land purchases with the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and private groups that are lobbying Congress for funds. The only money that has been appropriated is for the land exchanges.

The Steens Mountain web site is located at: < <http://www.or.blm.gov/steens> >. The Burn District web site is located at: < <http://www.or.blm.gov/Burns> >.

09:15 Update: Bully Creek Landscape Area Management Project (LAMP) - Roy Masinton

Roy gave a PowerPoint presentation. This presentation will be mailed to each member with the draft minutes from this meeting. Note: Roy shared with the group that he has accepted a new position to Canyon City, Colorado. Tom Dabbs will be the Acting in Roy's absence.

Roy gave an update of the SEORAC involvement and the letter which was sent to all council members. Currently, the SEORAC cannot be involved because of the court decision and mediation (May 8-9, 2001) processes that are taking effect. The IBLA case is currently under consideration (appeals/stay). The SEORAC may be used in the future, rather than work on Bully Creek specifically, the BLM may ask for assistance for review of the LAMP process, public involvement, and the planning process.

Bob Kindschy asked about the Geographic Management Areas (GMAs) versus the LAMP. Roy explained the GMA is an area of consideration and the LAMP is a plan for the management of that area.

Jill Workman asked if the SEORAC could form a subcommittee that could discuss the review of the LAMP process, public involvement, and the planning process.

Jill Workman asked if the council would be interested in a subcommittee on the Federal planning process and the public involvement process? Bob Kindschy stated that not only grazing was involved. Sharon Sweeney restated the question that the subcommittee would not be involved in resource issues but rather public involvement. Chad Boyd asked if this issue may be bigger, an issue of process rather than getting the word out? Sandy Guches and Roy Masinton stated that they got no public involvement in the process, public meetings and no one shows. Roy stated that this issue is good in that it brought attention to the need for public participation early in the process and now more members of the public will be involved earlier.



Chad Boyd asked for a timeline of events of public involvement for the SEORAC review and discuss at the next meeting, then a determination can be made as to whether or not a subcommittee needs to be formed on the issue.

Tom Harris was concerned that the public perceives the council as biased.

Walt Van Dyke asked if the Bully Creek LAMP should have had a subcommittee developed early in the process? Roy Masinton stated that it was discussed earlier but the SEORAC was working on other plans and did not decide to form a subcommittee. Tom Harris stated that he believed the council felt the LAMP process was a public involvement process and at that time they did not believe that a review process was needed.

The SEORAC decided to take Chad Boyd's suggestion and have a timeline completed and mailed to the council for review prior to the Burns meeting. At the Burns meeting a decision will be made as to whether or not a subcommittee will be formed to look at the LAMP and public involvement process.

10:00 BREAK

10:25 National and Local Fire Planning Report - Tom Schmidt

Tom Schmidt gave a PowerPoint presentation. This PowerPoint presentation will be mailed to each member with the draft minutes from this meeting.

Web site location is: < <http://www.or.blm.gov/nwcc/index.htm> >

Tom Harris asked about communication for prescribed fire process but what about wildfire? Tom Schmidt explained that we do have a national process for wildfire that is in place and we do not see a change in this area. The difference now is that we have more resources.

Bob Kindschy asked if funds will be available for the next 15-20 years to accomplish these tasks? Tom Schmidt stated this was an issue and currently we are still seeing the funds and guarantees from Congress. Tom also said that fire would have to remind Congress of the process and where it is at.

Cecil Dick asked who was responsible for prescribed fires that get away and the application process. The agency review process would determine. March 20 and June 30 grant application dates were discussed.

Chad Boyd was concerned about the education component needed to address logging and smoke in the area for treatment of fuels. Tom Schmidt followed up with examples of the ongoing processes.

Tom Harris asked if the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) was on board on this process? Tom Schmidt said Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), DEQ, and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) were also involved in this process.

Bob Kindschy inquired about who sets priorities. Tom Schmidt said that Congress established these priorities. Bob followed up with his concern over structural priorities versus resource priorities. Tom believes the National Fire Plan will assist with these issues and gave some examples. Fire fighting priorities for actual fires are going to remain the same, people and property will have greater priority than resource values.

Ken Bentz asked about fuels reduction processes. Tom Schmidt followed up with examples of fuel ladders and fuels reduction options.

Steve Ellis followed up with Bob Kindschy's issue. He stated that last summer in Idaho there was an issue of sage grouse on the range versus timber in the forest, there are issues that we will be faced with concerning resource issues and values. Do we send limited resources to the range or the forest? Generally, in the past, it has gone to the forest, now we may have to balance with sensitive species on the range. These will be sensitive issues that our

Manager's will have to deal with. Must take a proactive look at fire planning and priorities.

John Monfore asked how these funds could be used for land exchanges to get the Federal agencies out of the areas in the urban areas or scattered parcels.

Miles Brown stated that several prescribed fires include private land. Tom Schmidt followed up with stating this would continue and become used more.

Tom Schmidt stated that the regulatory agencies are working with us on these processes to get this done up front to try and streamline.

#### 11:15 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Roger Corrigan spoke on the grazing permittees perspective in the Bully Creek area. The other members present yielded their time to Roger on their behalf. Background: OSU Graduate, B.S. Range Management, prior BLM Supervisory Rangeland Management Specialist. Roger read a background document which will be mailed to each SEORAC member for review. Roger expressed concern about the 50 percent utilization level requirement based on the Vale Iron Side Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) issue. He noted range condition in the area affected is 80 percent of good to fair with an upward condition not poor. He also clarified issues on herbaceous versus woody species in an area and season of use and flexibility of seasons of use. Roger noted the permittees had asked the BLM for a national review of the riparian areas and were told that Wayne Elmore did not have the time to complete this review. The permittees also felt the team who initially reviewed these areas did this during an extremely wet year and identified areas that normally do not have water and the team was not properly trained. The permittees do feel they are working toward riparian enhancements and believe they are concerned with the area and want to work toward achieving goals for riparian areas. Roger addressed concerns over measurable condition classes.

All members of the public attending yielded their 5-minute time to Roger Corrigan to address the council on their behalf.

11:45 LUNCH was ordered in so questions could be asked of Bully Creek Permittee Panel

Mike Hartwell discussed the April 24, 2001, wildfire tour.

12:00 Noon the Bully Creek Permittees Question and Answer Panel

- Roger Corrigan
- David Post
- Chris Post, Chairperson of the Bully Creek Coalition

John Monfore questioned the permittees on the extent and impact of trespass. Roger agreed that trespass was a problem and does happen. He believes that both the permittee and the BLM should make an effort to ensure this does not happen. It is not unlike any other area, there are cows that get into areas where they should not be. He believes that the permittees do remove cattle as soon as notified and fix any fences that need to be fixed. Some areas take a long time to restore areas and the BLM's view.

John Monfore questioned the pastures and flexibility. The response was the flexibility of pastures is run in common, they do not believe they have enough pastures, carrying capacity of the pastures and the AUMs were not analyzed, another issue is the flexibility of the LAMP - how easy is it to change based on such things as weather patterns, forage issues, on the grazing issues. Utilization standards reduced by 20 to 30 percent on the uplands, reduce amount of season of use on riparian areas, these areas will be affected. Herders could help in some areas, but there are areas where it is hard to keep them from the water sources. Roger gave an example of a trailing and herding efforts.

Marilyn Miller asked for the documentation of the credential scientist quoted in the paper Roger presented. Roger

gave some examples of literature used which differed with LAMP requirements. Roger will give copies of the original source documents for the SEORAC to review.

Tom Harris asked if Roger participated in the LAMP planning process. Roger said he believes the permittees were kept in the dark through the process. He felt discussions did not indicate the severity that the LAMP proposed. These were work discussions with the Range Conservationists, not at the scoping meetings.

Jane O'Keeffe asked if it was a failure of process or incorrect data? Roger believes that the data collection was not done by qualified persons. Felt they have not been listened to, please follow the National Riparian Teams recommendations. The coalition has worked with a lot of agencies of people to get a plan together which worked, the people changed in the BLM and discarded the prior plan which everyone agreed on.

Chad Boyd asked for the one thing that could have stopped the court case. Roger said the BLM could have gotten the National Riparian Team, the SEORAC, and more people involved with the process when identified. The scientific community and National Riparian Team should be added to the document. All parties should sit down together to fix the problem not just try and do it in a closed system.

Perception of the RAC? With regard to the RAC, they trust several members of the RAC but there is a perception of it is Babbit's/Clinton's idea, and there is a 50/50 split for the support of the RAC locally. The only issue was stopping the legal action in the SEORAC review, do support the RAC involvement.

Ken Bentz asked if there will be economic impact from implementation? Roger said yes, it varies from 20 to 74 percent because of change in needs for feed, other pastures, herding, cannot bring back to private, may have to go out of business.

Jill Workman asked if legislative buyouts were an option. Roger stated the permittees do not want buyouts, they want to continue ranching/lifestyle. Projects or funding for water development. We do not have potential to develop areas for water. Fencing may work in some areas. Pipelines may work in some areas. In some cases BLM has worked in area.

Really believes that if everyone would work together and not try to optimize every resource, good compromise could be achieved.

Where the environmental analysis was concerned - required to look at the adverse impacts, using mitigation to lessen the impacts - LAMP was lacking in this area, only talks benefits and no adverse impacts.

John Monfore asked about flexibility on coming off the range/range readiness. A discussion ensued concerning season of use and that concluded the panel.

01:35 Update: Lakeview RMP Subcommittee Report - Chad Boyd

Scott Florence thanked the SEORAC for the time taken to work on the Draft Lakeview RMP. Currently, the BLM is working on Chapter 4, hoping to have completed the draft within a month, then an OSO review in May, State Director briefing middle of June, draft to print June-July, then a 90-day public comment period, subcommittee involved will be requested again during the public comment period. There is a handout concerning your first review of the RMP. The subcommittee does have a revised Chapter 3.

Chad Boyd said the subcommittee met on April 5, 2001. The council reviewed the comment pages and Chad will note these changes. Since there is not a quorum to vote, an unofficial document will be prepared from the SEORAC comments and mailed to each member and the BLM.

There is a vacant position on the subcommittee and Lee Belknap has volunteered to fill this vacancy.

01:15 Minerals in the Southeast Oregon Area Presentation - Howard Brooks

Howard gave the council a brief background and biography. He gave a PowerPoint presentation. This presentation



was given to all SEORAC members.

02:30 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-determination Act of 2000 and establishment of the associated RAC  
- Steve Grasty and Jane O'Keeffe

Jane and Steve handed out a copy of the act.

Jane explained that this bill helps counties with reduced forest/road receipts. P.L. 106-393 Safety Net Legislation. About 3 years ago, County Commissioners started looking how to replace forest receipts, it is called the Federal Safety Net. It is a 6-year bill. Basically the money comes to counties from timber receipts and the Federal funding used for roads, schools, projects on the forest with RACs, and Title II and III projects (identified in the handout).

Steve Grasty talked about the funding formulas for the counties and that 15 percent will be held in a Federal trust for projects. This is where RACs will be formed to recommend projects to the counties. As of today, the Office of the General Council has stated that the west side counties cannot give the ONC money to the east side counties. Now, the east side counties will not need a RAC since funding is currently not available.

Tom Dyer asked if this RAC would be interested if the money comes around next year. Steve Grasty believes only legislative action could change this to where the east side counties would benefit from the donation from the west side ONC counties.

03:15 Review of SEORAC Meeting Guides and Approval of the January 22-23, 2001 Meeting Minutes - Jill Workman

Focus on objectives was changed to focus on issue on the meeting guides.

Page 5 and Page 10 corrections are noted on the January SEORAC minutes and will be changed, council cannot vote since we do not have a quorum. We will approve at the next meeting in Burns, Oregon.

Walt Van Dyke asked to address the council concerning sage grouse. The BLM, Interim Sage Grouse Guidelines and the new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreement to develop a long-term conservation plan. State must develop a long-term conservation strategy, need a steering committee to work on this effort, representatives would be requested from Federal, State, Regulatory, and RACs.

Walt asks:

- Does the RAC want to participate?
- How many representatives from the RAC?
- Who would they be?

Council asks:

- How often would this steering committee meet? The steering committee will have to decide once formed.
- Would per diem be included? Walt will ask.
- Additional long-term strategies for BLM or will BLM adopt this agreement developed by ODFW? Yes, BLM will participate in and follow this long-term plan/MOU.
- Steering committee will advise the people who are writing the plan. Strategies, timeline, and outlines would be developed by the steering committee.

Steve Ellis stated that the BLM will participate with the State, but the State has the lead. BLM will continue to follow the BLM, Interim Sage Grouse Guidelines.

Motion to approve involvement in the Sage Grouse Steering Committee by Tom Harris.

Howard Brooks seconded the motion to be involved in this process.

Table vote for a quorum at the Burns meeting.

03:45 Federal Officials' Update

Tom Dyer - (Update given in minutes and not at meeting)

Since their last meeting in October 2000:

1. 370 horses removed from Alvord Tule, Coyote Lake, and Murderer's Creek HMAs
2. 213 horses adopted in OR/WA through walk-up appointments and three adoption events
3. 186 compliance inspections completed this FY in OR/WA
4. Plan to conduct two more gathers in OR this FY, one large one and one small one. We have funding and approval to remove 300 more horses this fiscal year. On-the-ground conditions will determine the highest priority areas to gather. It may be Warm Springs and Liggett Table that will be gathered in August 2001.
5. There is a need to gather ASAP three other HMAs. These are Sheephead, Beatys Butte, and Three Fingers. A probable schedule is Beatys Butte in October and Sheephead in January. These gatherings would involve removal of 655 head.
6. The WO is developing a contingency plan to deal with drought conditions in the west that may trigger emergency gathers.
7. Emergency gathers mean horses running out of water and very limited forage conditions.

Cody Hansen - spoke about the Statewide drought meeting (as of April 18, only 55 percent of normal precipitation has fallen, varying between 38 to 75 percent Statewide), there will likely be voluntary reductions in AUMs, additional wild horse gathers, sensitive species/fish concerns, road closures in high Industrial Fire Precaution Levels (IFPLs) 1-4, recreational activities affected, and bough/wood cutting restrictions required. Tom Dyer stated that we would inform the RAC of issues as they happen.

Steve Ellis - to fill fire jobs, BLM is stealing from other agencies. Lakeview District has burned 1,500 acres this spring in a prescribed fire program. There will be a wild horse adoption on May 5-6, 2001, at Klamath Falls, and a gather on Beatys Butte this October. Scoping on the River Plan for Upper Klamath Wild and Scenic River (W&SR) is starting; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing on the Klamath River is ongoing. There is no BLM director nominated as of yet. The budget for BLM is level from last year except for an increase in energy/minerals and planning. Steve is Acting for Chuck Graham - Mary and Frank will be going to Utah - Chuck has a new fish (the moduck sucker) on the Fremont National Forest. The FS is trying to determine what this means and how they will manage for this species. There is some question if the biological opinion will be required or not; it may only need monitoring for the next 3 years.

Scott Florence gave a Wilderness Therapy School update. Currently, the issue of permit revocation is with IBLA. The State is looking at a licensing legislation for these schools.

Jerry Taylor - Owyhee W&SR legislation is coming to a close, completed the first report on the order, most fence and pipelines were constructed, the EIS will be completed in 3 years after additional data is collected, currently looking at entering into a stipulated agreement with all parties so the court can be released from this agreement and the EIS requirement. Also, will be starting on the Lost Canyon GMA process in the near future.

Sandy Guches - SEORMP is at the printer for a May 10, 2001 distribution, thanks to Burns District help on SEORMP, especially Glenn Patterson. Vale has 36 additional positions to fill in fire; outreach with local and rural fire departments is currently being done. District Manager has not been selected but interviews have been completed.

Reviewed dinner arrangements and tour information.

04:45 Agenda Items and meeting dates for the SEORAC Meeting BLM, Burns District Conference Room, Hines, Oregon - Sharon Sweeney

Identify action items/decision items on future agendas.

Meeting date will remain July 9-10, 2001

- Back Country Discovery Route Update
- Advise not updates, more proactive stuff
- Sage Grouse Long-term Plan Representation and Participation
- Subcommittee Issues and Meeting times
- Lakeview RMP Recommendation Vote
- Charter Issues
- Bully Creek Process Review
- Minutes review/vote for January and April meetings
- SMAC/SEORAC Coordination
- Public involvement for the SEORAC - outreach efforts - evening sessions - etc...
- Current Forest Management Actions - more involved in Forest Issues
- OHV Strategy and Planning money budget/funding
- Steens and SMAC Update

**Please advise RAC prior to invitation of dedication date.**

**Tuesday, April 24, 2001**

07:45 Meet in Holiday Inn lobby area

08:00 Leave promptly for the Wildfire Issues Associated with the Urban Interface Tour

12:00 Noon Return to Holiday Inn Lobby Area

## Field Tour to Jackson Fire of July 2000

Mike Hartwell, Vale District Fire Management Officer and Jerry Erstrom, Vale District Weed Coordinator hosted the tour which focused on fire and noxious weed issues related to urban interface areas near Vale and Ontario.

Major fire issues discussed included:

Dealing with fire fighting strategies in the middle of a fast-moving, direction-changing fire which is threatening private homes, structures, crops, and equipment.

Note: The Jackson Fire burned nearly 80,000 acres in less than 12 hours, with 360 degree shifts in the winds. The winds were forecast to be about 10 miles per hour but exceeded 60 miles per hour during the fire. Only one major structure was destroyed by the fire and there were no serious injuries to people.

BLM fire personnel's frustration, with the lack of a common communication system with local landowners during the height of the conflagration. Firefighters could not implement their burnouts to stop the fire due to the presence of private individuals carrying out their own tactics, sometimes directly in the path of an agency planned burnout.

Difficulty in helping save structures and other private property, because of the lack of training of the Federal firefighters to fight structural fires.

Development of coordinated private/city/county/State/Federal fire planning and fire fighting strategy, to avoid future situations such as the Jackson Fire.

BLM training private citizens on fire fighting strategies and techniques. The Vale District is offering to do the same training as have other BLM units in other places in the west.

Use and evaluation of a variety of green strip plantings in various areas to break up the continuous highly flammable cheatgrass stands, especially in areas like the Jackson Fire.

Issues relating to removal of livestock during fire rehabilitation efforts.

Issues related to conducting fire rehabilitation measures in areas where Threatened and Endangered species are present.

Issues related to poor growing conditions during establishment of fire rehabilitation seedings and green strip plantings.

The Vale District's outreach program, implemented this spring, to assist private landowners in reducing the potential for wildfires to damage their property. The Vale District fire personnel will be visiting with private landowners and offering their assistance to create a defensible space around their homes and other properties.

Major issues discussed on the topic of noxious weeds included:

Need for coordination similar to that envisioned with fire management.

Impact of the moratorium on use of certain effective herbicides in Oregon.

Issues relating to the spreading of weeds and lack of good replacement plant species.

Use of mechanical and fire treatments and the need for followup seeding to prevent reinvasion of the weeds.

Use of natives versus nonnative plants to prevent reinvasion of weeds into treated areas.

Need for larger stocks of native plant seed for fire rehabilitation use and extremely high current costs.

The tour was conducted by bus and returned to the Holiday Inn shortly after noon ending the tour and meeting.